UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,999	01/16/2001	Janet Arlie Barnett	RD-28,556	6045

6147   7590   10/19/2004

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER
EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 July 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to amendment received on July 21, 2004. Claims 1-30

are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jerger

et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,321,334 (referred to hereafter as Jerger).

As to claims 1 and 25, Jerger teaches a method and a computer-readable

medium for managing a user community, comprising:

defining a set of user attributes for each user in the user community (see col. 3

lines 9-15); and

identifying a permission level for managing each of the user attributes (see col. 3

lines 16-26).

As to claims 2, 5, 8, 23, 26 and 29, Jerger teaches the method according to claim

1, wherein each permission level defines administrative operations that an administrator

can and cannot perform on a user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claims 3, 6, 9, 24, 27 and 30, Jerger teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising defining restricted values that an administrator can assign for the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 4, Jerger teaches a method for managing user information associated with a user community, comprising:

defining a set of user attributes from the user information for each user the user community (see col. 3 lines 9-15);

identifying a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

managing the user attributes according to each of the permission levels (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 7, Jerger teaches a method for enabling an administrator to control administration of a user community, comprising:

providing user information associated with the user community to the administrator (see col. 3 lines 9-15);

prompting the administrator to define a set of user attributes for each user in the user community (see col. 3 lines 16-26);

prompting the administrator to identify a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

using the identified permission levels to control administration of the user

information (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claims 10 and 21, Jerger teaches a user community administration tool for

managing user information associated with a user community, comprising:

a domain definition component and means that defines the user community into

at least one administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 9-15 and col. 17 lines 1-55),

the domain definition component comprising a user group specifying component

that specifies at least one arbitrary group of users from the user community and a user

attribute definition component that defines a set of permissible user attributes for the at

least one arbitrary group of users (see col. 3 lines 16-26); and

an information management component and means that manages the user

information associated with the administrative domain in accordance with the

permissible user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claims 11 and 22, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, wherein

the user attribute definition component comprises an attribute permission component

that specifies a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 12, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 11, wherein each

permission level defines operations that an administrator can and cannot perform on a

user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 13, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, wherein the user

attribute definition component comprises an attribute restricted value component that

defines restricted values that an administrator can assign for any of the user attributes

(see col. 3 lines 42-57).

As to claim 14, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 10, further comprising

an administrative privileges component that grants administrative privileges for the

administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 42-57).

As to claim 15, Jerger teaches the tool according to claim 14, wherein the

administrative privileges component delegates the granted administrative privileges for

the administrative domain (see col. 3 lines 27-57).

As to claim 16, Jerger teaches a system for managing user information

associated with a user community, comprising:

a database directory containing a plurality of user information (see col. 14 lines

27-42);

a user community administration tool to manage the plurality of user information

in the database directory; the user community administration tool comprising a domain

definition component that defines the user community into at least one administrative

domain, the domain definition component comprising a user group specifying

component that specifies at least one arbitrary group of users from the user community

and a user attribute definition component that defines a set of permissible user

attributes for the at least one arbitrary group of users; and an information management

component that manages the user information associated with the administrative

domain in accordance with the permissible user attributes; and a first computing unit

configured to serve the user community administration tool and the database directory

(see col. 3 lines 9-67) .

As to claim 17, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, further

comprising a second computing unit configured to execute the user community

administration tool served from the first computing unit over a network (see col. 3 lines

9-41).

As to claim 18, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, wherein the

user attribute definition component comprises an attribute permission component that

specifies a permission level for each of the user attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 19, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 18, wherein each

permission level defines operations that an administrator can and cannot perform on a

user attribute (see col. 3 lines 27-41).

As to claim 20, Jerger teaches the system according to claim 16, wherein the

user attribute definition component comprises an attribute restricted value component

that defines restricted values that an administrator can assign for any of the user

attributes (see col. 3 lines 55-65).

As to claim 28, Jerger teaches a computer-readable medium storing computer

instructions for instructing a computer system to enable an administrator to control

administration of a user community, the computer instructions comprising:

providing user information associated with the user community to the

administrator (see col. 3 lines 9-15);;

prompting the administrator to define a set of user attributes for each of the users

in the user community (see col. 3 lines 16-26);;

prompting the administrator to identify a permission level for each of the user

attributes; and using the identified permission levels to control administration of the user

information (see col. 3 lines 16-26).

3.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; A) Jerger does not teach

defining a set of user attributes for each user in the user community; B) Jerger does not

identifying a permission level for managing each of the user attributes.

In response to A) Jerger teaches a method where a user has a set of permission

attributes where the user can assign values to the security permission attributes in

regards to content stored on a network (see col. 3 lines 9-55). Applicant is arguing

attributes of the present invention include address, job or employer. These limitation are

not found in the claims. Claimed subject matter net the specification is the measure of

the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims.

There are no limitations on the kind of user attributes and who defines the user

attributes and therefore Jerger's security user attributes meets the scope of the claimed

limitation "defining a set of user attributes for each user in the user community".

In response to B) Jerger teaches assigns a level for the security attributes where there are for example three levels of security (trusted, untrusted and unassigned). There is no limitation on on the kind of user attributes and who defines the user attributes and therefore Jerger's security user attributes meets the scope of the claimed limitation "identifying a permission level for managing each of the user attributes".

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hussein A El-chanti whose telephone number is (703)305-4652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hussein El-chanti

Oct. 7, 2004

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER